

# Evaluation Express Award Application

To request Evaluation Set-Aside funds via the Evaluation Express Award, complete the following application. Please limit your application to three single-spaced pages.

*Submit your application to evaluate@od.nih.gov.*

---

## Part 1: Identification

---

Project Title: **Cancer Imaging Program: Small Animal Imaging Resource Program (SAIRP) Evaluation**

Applicant: (include name, title, IC or OD office, building, room, phone, fax, and email):

Barbara Croft, Ph.D., Program Direction, NCI, EPN 6064, 301-435-9025,  
[bc129b@nih.gov](mailto:bc129b@nih.gov)

---

## Part 2: Purpose of the Evaluation

---

*Indicate the type of evaluation proposed and the rationale for conducting the evaluation.*

**Type of Evaluation** — Indicate the primary type of proposed evaluation:

- |                      |                       |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Needs Assessment  | 3. Process Evaluation |
| 2. Feasibility Study | 4. Outcome Evaluation |

**Rationale for the Evaluation** — Briefly describe the rationale for conducting the evaluation (e.g., Congressional mandate, stakeholder interest, general interest).

The SAIRPs (and their sister program, the In vivo Cellular and Molecular Imaging Centers - ICMICs), have been funded for several years. NCI is considering funding additional SAIRPs starting in January of 2007, and an evaluation of the program is important prior to making this decision. The first step in this process is to conduct a feasibility study to identify the most appropriate method for evaluating the SAIRPs and develop an evaluation design. The grantee annual progress reports give a snapshot of the activities, but mostly present their results in terms of numbers of papers published and grants funded. To assess the effectiveness of the program, we would like to develop a design for evaluating the SAIRPs, to present to the NCI DCTD administration, the NCI Executive Committee, and to the community of cancer researchers. Upon completion of the feasibility study we will conduct a program evaluation, the results of which will be used to help design future programs of this kind, as well as to give feedback to the evaluated programs.

---

## Part 3: NIH Program to be Evaluated

---

*Provide a brief description of the NIH program or activity under consideration, including the documented goals of the program/activity.*

**NIH Program/activity** — Name and briefly describe the NIH program/activity to be examined (e.g., organizational location, history, program size/budget, # of FTEs).

Program name: SAIRP (Small Animal Imaging Resource Program)

## Evaluation Express Award Application

Program Description: The Small Animal Imaging Resource Program (SAIRP) issues grants to support (a) shared imaging research resources to be used by cancer investigators, (b) research related to small animal imaging technology, and (c) training of both professional and technical support personnel interested in the science and techniques of small animal imaging. It has been funded by the Cancer (previously Diagnostic, then Biomedical) Imaging Program, of the Division of Cancer Treatment and Diagnosis. The first RFA was issued in 1999, with 5 sites funded for 5 years; the second was issued in 2001, again with 5 sites funded for 5 years. In 2004, the RFA was reissued, with 3 of the original 5 sites competing successfully and 2 new sites being funded, again with funding for 5 years. Since the grants to the 2<sup>nd</sup> 5 sites are ending in December 2006, the RFA is being prepared for reissue for funding in January 2007. The budget in each RFA is about \$18M for 5 years and 5 sites. Thus in any one year, with 10 sites, the budget is \$7.2M. The management is by the program director and the chief of the Molecular Imaging Branch. There is an annual meeting for the PIs.

Program goal(s) – Specify the documented goals of the program or the program's intended effect(s). Indicate which goals are relevant to the evaluation.

The goals of the SAIRP program are: 1) to provide a resource consisting of a number of imaging instruments and collaboration in their use for the cancer researchers in their institutions; and 2) to do research on the technology of small animal imaging, and 3) to provide education about the techniques and utility of small animal imaging in cancer research. Particularly relevant to the evaluation are the service function and the educational function.

The goals of this feasibility study are:

1. To determine the optimal approach for evaluating the SAIRP program
2. To identify appropriate evaluation questions and adequate measures for a subsequent evaluation
3. To develop a detailed evaluation plan and methodology for the subsequent evaluation
4. To develop a detailed budget for conducting a subsequent evaluation

---

### Part 4: Evaluation Design and Dissemination/Use of Results

---

*Provide a list of key questions that you will address in the evaluation, a description of the study design, and your plans for disseminating and using the evaluation results.*

Key Question(s) to be Addressed – List the specific study question(s). These questions define what you are trying to learn from the evaluation effort and should be linked to the relevant program goals in Part 3 above.

The key questions to be addressed by this feasibility study are:

- 1) What is the most appropriate method for evaluating the SAIRP?
- 2) What measures are appropriate for this evaluation?
- 3) What data relevant to the measures are currently available, and what data will require new collection methods?
- 4) How will the data be collected?

We anticipate some research questions in the follow-up evaluation may be:

- 1) What type of research questions are being addressed with imaging?
- 2) At what stage in cancer therapy drug development is imaging being used?

## Evaluation Express Award Application

- 3) Are new imaging agents being developed specifically to support research with SAIRP collaborators?
- 4) How have the SAIRPs advanced the technology of small animal imaging?
- 5) What approaches to training in small animal imaging methods and applications have been used and which are the most effective?

We anticipate measures used for the follow-up evaluation may include:

- 1) Numbers of grants per year using SAIRP facilities;
- 2) Progress toward independent funding of facility;
- 3) Numbers of trainees, courses given, outside investigators collaborated with, and the papers published as a result of SAIRP collaborations.

**Study Design** – Describe the overall approach you intend to use to answer the key question(s) (e.g., data sources, statistical sampling information, plans for data collection and analysis). Please note if the evaluation will require any clearances (e.g., OMB Clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act).

The parties interested in the feasibility of the evaluation of the SAIRPs include the leadership of the Division of Cancer Treatment and Diagnosis and of the Division of Cancer Biology, as well as the SAIRP investigators. Participants from these groups will work with a contractor to:

- 1) Finalize the set of key questions to be addressed by the outcome evaluation;
- 2) Determine what types of measures, data collection strategies, and analysis methods are most appropriate for conducting the outcome evaluation;
- 3) Develop the evaluation design and data collection tools;
- 4) Identify the timeline and resource requirements for conducting the outcome evaluation;
- 5) Develop a final report that can be used as an application for set-aside funds to conduct outcome evaluation;
- 6) Initiate subsequent program evaluation.

No OMB clearance is anticipated to be required for the feasibility study because the evaluation design is not expected to involve survey activities covered by OMB.

**Dissemination/Use of Results** – Describe how you will disseminate the evaluation results and how the results of the evaluation will be used. Indicate whether or not you expect to make changes to the program based on the evaluation results.

The report from the feasibility study will be used as the application for set-aside funds to conduct an outcome evaluation of the SAIRPs. Information from the feasibility study will be used to create an approach to an evaluation of the SAIRPs. The report of the feasibility study will be posted on the NCI intranet and used as the design for the SAIRP evaluation.

## Evaluation Express Award Application

---

### Part 5: Project Management and Budget Estimate

---

*Provide a project timeline, information about who will conduct the evaluation, and a summary of the anticipated costs and funding sources.*

**Estimated Timeline** – Identify when each major evaluation task will occur, including expected start and end dates.

<b><u>Task</u></b>	<b><u>Timeline</u></b>
Pre-Contract Award	
Develop project statement of work	Weeks 1-2
Solicit RFP and review proposals	Weeks 3-9
Post-Contract Award	
Develop project work plan- meet with contractor; contractor review of background material; contractor preparation of draft and final work plan	Weeks 1-6
Contact participants and hold meetings of local personnel and conference calls for investigators to discuss measures, data collection and analysis methods	Weeks 7-20
Develop and pretest evaluation design and data collection methods	Weeks 21-23
Final report – contractor draft report, NCI review, contractor final report	Weeks 23-26

**Project Implementation** – Describe how the project will be implemented (e.g., independent consultant, contractor selected via an RFP, task order contract). Provide the name of the contractor/consultant(s) (if known) and attach the Statement of Work (if available).

Negotiations with qualified independent contactors will begin upon award. It is anticipated that a contractor will be identified and selected via the GSA/MOBIS contract schedule. The consultant who is deemed able to provide the best value within the identified timeframe will be selected. Upon award, CIP staff will meet with the contractor to create a plan to work with the interested parties.

**Funding Amount Requested** – Provide overall costs by category, including direct labor costs, other direct costs (e.g., printing, consultants, meetings, travel), and indirect costs (e.g., fringe benefits, overhead, contractor's fee). Indicate the anticipated source(s) of these funds (e.g., Evaluation Set-Aside, IC budget).

Set-aside funds of \$50,000 are requested to support the feasibility study. A detailed budget is available later in this document (see below). A final budget will be available after negotiations with qualified contractors are completed. Any costs beyond \$50,000 will be covered by NCI program funds.

# Evaluation Express Award Application

## Express Application Budget SAIRP

8/2/2005

Barbara Croft

SUMMARY OF COSTS			
HOURLY			
<u>SALARIED LABOR</u>	<u>RATE</u>	<u>HOURS</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Project Manager	65.00	10	650
Senior Researcher	50.00	220	11,000
Junior Researcher	25.00	240	6,000
EDITOR	30.00	40	1,200
		-	-
<b>TOTAL SALARIED LABOR</b>		<b>510</b>	<b>18,850</b>
<u>OTHER DIRECT COSTS</u>			
COMPUTING			500
TRAVEL			100
COPYING			600
SUPPLIES			400
OTHER COSTS			100
			-
<b>TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS</b>			<b>1,700</b>
			-
<u>OVERHEAD</u>			
SALARIED LABOR @	100.0%		20,550
			-
<b>TOTAL OVERHEAD</b>			<b>20,550</b>
			-
TOTAL DIRECT PLUS OVERHEAD			41,100
G & A - @	15.0%		6,165
			-
<b>TOTAL COST</b>			<b>47,265</b>
FEE @	8.0%		3,781
			-
<b>TOTAL COST PLUS FEE</b>			<b>51,046</b>